1		
2		
3		
4		
5		
6		
7		
8	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON	
9	WESTERN DISTRICT AT TAC	
10		
11	JAY L. LAMB and SHARI D.	CASE NO. C10-5856 RJB
12	HULTBERG,	ORDER GRANTING CHICAGO
13	Plaintiffs,	TITLE INSURANCE COMPANY, LSI DIVISION'S MOTION TO
	V.	DISMISS
14	MORTGAGE ELECTRONIC REGISTRATION SYSTEMS, INC.;	
15	CHICAGO TITLE INSURANCE COMPANY, LSI DIVISION; THE BANK	
16	OF NEW YORK MELLON TRUST	
17	COMPANY, N.A., F/K/A THE BANK OF NEW YORK TRUST COMPANY, N.A.	
18	AS SUCCESSOR TO JP MORGAN CHASE BANK N.A., AS TRUSTEE FOR	
19	RAMP 2004RSS6; and GMAC MORTGAGE, LLC,	
20	Defendants.	
21	This matter comes before the Court on Def	endant Chicago Title Incurance Company J.S.
22	This matter comes before the Court on Defendant Chicago Title Insurance Company, LSI Division's motion for an order dismissing Plaintiffs' amended verified complaint for failure to	
23	Division's motion for an order dismissing Plaintiff	s amended verified complaint for failure to
24		

state a claim. Dkt. 50. The Plaintiffs have not filed a response. The Court has considered the motion and the record herein. On November 18, 2011, this Court dismissed Plaintiffs' claims against Defendants Bank of New York Mellon Trust Company, National Association/ f/k/a Bank of New York Trust Company, N.A., as Successor to JP Morgan Chase Bank N.A., as Trustee for RAMP 2004RS6 (Bank of New York); Mortgage Electronic Registration Systems, Inc. (MERS); and GMAC Mortgage, LLC (GMAC). Dkt. 49. Plaintiffs' claims were held to be frivolous and without merit. Id. The remaining Defendant, Chicago Title Company, LSI Division, now moves for similar relief. Plaintiffs have failed to respond. On July 21, 2011, Plaintiffs filed an Amended Verified Complaint. Dkt. 30. The amended complaint alleges the following claims for relief: (1) breach of contract, apparently for Defendants' failure to answer a qualified written request, as is required by the Real Estate Settlement Procedures Act (RESPA), 12 U.S.C. § 2605(e); (2) violation of the Fair Debt Collection Practices Act (FDCPA), 15 U.S.C. § 1692, et seq., for failing to verify the alleged debt and for failing to offer to validate the debt; (3) violation of the Fair Credit Reporting Act (FCRA), 15 U.S.C. § 1608, for erroneously reporting the alleged debt/obligation on Plaintiffs' credit reports; (4) foreclosure of an incorrect Note; (5) wrongful foreclosure for failure to file a tax return and statement showing that Plaintiffs' property was acquired as part of an asset pool; (6) lack of standing to foreclose because the Note at issue is a non-negotiable security; (7) failure to comply with the Washington Deed of Trust Act (DTA), RCW 61.24, because the Deed of Trust was assigned to The Bank of New York twenty-three days before the Trustee's sale occurred; (8) slander of title, based upon Defendants' recording of the Notice of Trustee's Sale; (9) negligence for recording the Notice of Trustee's Sale; (10) declaratory relief, on the basis that

2

3

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1	the Mortgage Electronic Registration System (MERS) could not serve as a beneficiary of the	
2	Note; and (11) injunctive relief for material violation of the DTA. Dkt. 30, at 5-10.	
3	In this Court's previous Order (Dkt. 49), each of these claims were addressed and found	
4	to be without merit. Further, none of these claims are specifically addressed to the conduct of	
5	Chicago Title Company.	
6	Chicago Title Company was the trustee in the nonjudicial foreclosure of the subject real	
7	property. As noted in the previous Order, Chicago Title Company was appointed successor	
8	trustee by an appointment document recorded on April 1, 2009 under Kitsap County Auditor's	
9	File Number ("AFN") 200904010085. Dkt. 49 pp. 6. On May 7, 2009, Chicago Title Company	
10	recorded the notice of trustee's sale under AFN 200905070209. Dkt. 49 pp. 7. Chicago Title	
11	Company conducted the November 20, 2009 trustee's sale and recorded the resulting trustee's	
12	deed on December 14, 2009 under AFN 20091214055. Id.	
13	As detailed in the Court's previous Order, the conduct of Chicago Title Company does	
14	not support a claim of liability under any of the asserted causes of action. See Dkt. 49 pp. 7-12.	
15	Accordingly, it is hereby ORDERED :	
16	Defendant Chicago Title Insurance Company, LSI Division's Motion to Dismiss	
17	(Dkt. 50) is GRANTED . The claims against Defendant Chicago Title Insurance Company, LSI	
18	Division are DISMISSED WITH PREJUDICE . There remaining no further claims, the action	
19	is DISMISSED in its entirety. The Order to Show Cause (Dkt. 53) is STRICKEN as MOOT .	
20	Dated this 3rd day of January, 2012.	
21	A DATE	
22	Maker 9 Duyan	
23	ROBERT J. BRYAN United States District Judge	
24		